

Perfect Entanglement Transport in Quantum Spin Chain Systems

Sujit Sarkar

1. PoornaPrajna Institute of Scientific Research,
4 Sadashivanagar, Bangalore 5600 80, India

(Dated: November 25, 2009)

We propose a mechanism for perfect entanglement transport in anti-ferromagnetic (AFM) quantum spin chain systems with modulated exchange coupling along the xy plane and in the z direction. We use the principle of adiabatic quantum pumping process for entanglement transfer in the spin chain systems. In our proposed mechanism, perfect entanglement transfer can be achieved over an arbitrary long distance. We explain analytically and physically why the entanglement hops in alternate sites. We solve this problem by using the Berry phase analysis and Abelian bosonization methods. We find the condition for blocking of entanglement transport even in the perfect pumping condition. We also explain physically why entanglement transfer in AFM chain outperforms the ferromagnetic chain. Our analytical solution interconnects quantum many body physics and quantum information science.

1. Introduction: Quantum communication between distant co-ordinates in a quantum network is an important requirement for quantum computation and information. One can construct the quantum network in different ways. Optical systems typically employed in quantum communication and cryptography application to transfer the state between two distinct co-ordinates directly via photons [1, 2]. Quantum computing applications work with trapped atoms to transfer information between distant sites, photons in cavity QED [3, 4, 5, 6, 7]. However we would like to study the entanglement transfer through the quantum spin chain systems [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17]. The equivalence of state transferring and teleportation of information transmission has already been studied in the literature [18, 19]. The potentiality of the spin chain system, antiferromagnetic (AFM) and ferromagnetic (FM), as a network of quantum state and entanglement transport has already been studied by many groups as referred in the literature. The experimental evidence of nanoscale spin chain and their properties have discussed in Ref. [20]. Our approach in this study is different from the existing studies in the literature [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17].

The literature of quantum entanglement study is quite vast in quantum computation science. Here we mention very briefly the important works that have already existed in state and entanglement transport in the literature: The authors of Ref. [13] have shown explicitly that the quality of state and entanglement transfer through all phases of spin-1 chain have been possible. Some AFM phases are more efficient than the FM phase. The authors of Ref. [14] have shown explicitly that dimerized AFM states of spin-1 chains are also able to transfer through an adiabatic modulation of exchange couplings. The authors of Ref. [12], have shown explicitly that the quantum information can be efficiently transferred between weakly coupled end spins of an AFM chain because of an effective coupling between the end spins. The au-

thors of Ref. [15, 16] have studied the quantum state and entanglement transfer and the authors of Ref. [17] have studied the entanglement dynamics, considering initial states deviating from the final states. The authors of Ref. [8, 19] have studied the entanglement transfer in a uniformly coupled spin-1/2 AFM/FM spin chain. They have claimed a curious result that for the AFM spin chain, the entanglement hops to skip alternate sites. They have also found that the entanglement transfer in the AFM chain outperforms the FM chain. We explain in our work that these theoretical predictions are natural. Here we mention very briefly the basic mechanism of entanglement transfer through the spin chain system based on the conventional wisdom in the literature [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17] and at the same time illustrate the difference with our approach.

It is well known that entanglement is the manifestation of quantum correlations between two systems when they are inseparable state. We consider the spin singlet state as an example of an entangled state.

$$|\psi^- \rangle_{0,0'} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[|0 \rangle_{0'}|1 \rangle_0 - |1 \rangle_{0'}|0 \rangle_0] \quad (1)$$

Typically, the sender holds one member of the state of the pair of qubits while putting the other member at the near end of the AFM spin chain of length N. The spin chain is in the ground state. When the spin 0 starts to interact with the first spin of the chain then the Hamiltonian includes this additional interaction term ($I_{0'} \otimes J \sigma_0 \cdot \sigma_1$), where σ_0 and σ_1 are the Pauli spin operators for the 0 and 1 sites respectively and J is the exchange coupling). The initial state being

$$|\psi(0) \rangle = |\psi^- \rangle_{0,0'} \otimes |\psi_g \rangle \quad (2)$$

Where $|\psi_g \rangle$ is the ground state wave function of the AFM Hamiltonian and $|\psi(0) \rangle$ is the ground state wave function of the total Hamiltonian. This initial state starts to evolve and from that one computes the density matrix

and concurrence to measure the entanglement and purity of states. But our approach is different. Our main motivation is to interconnect the quantum many body physics and quantum information science. It is common practice in quantum many body physics to create a particle at any point in the system and study the dynamics of that particle to understand the physical behaviour of the system. Therefore, we consider one of the spin ($\uparrow$ or $\downarrow$) of the singlet interacts with the spin chain and this spin itself transports through the chain medium due to the adiabatic variation of exchange couplings of the Hamiltonian, and reaches the other end of the chain. Our spin chains are the AFM spin chain with the modulated exchange couplings. But we consider the monogamous nature of the shared entanglement between the two spins 0 and 0'. Before we proceed further we would like to state the basic aspects of adiabatic pumping process: an adiabatic parametric quantum pump is a device that generates a dc current by a cyclic variation of system parameters, the variation being slow enough that the system remains close to the ground state throughout the pumping cycle [21, 22]. It is well known that when a quantum mechanical system evolves, it acquires a time dependent dynamical phase and time independent geometrical phase [23]. The geometrical phase depends on the geometry of the path in the parameter space. In the adiabatic entanglement pumping process, the locking potential well carries a spin of the singlet pairs. As the locking potential well slides through the adiabatic variation of system parameters, it induces a current (I) in the system. In this study we calculate the current of this spin transport, which transports a spin from one end of the chain to the other and as a result of which entanglement is transported (because the spin 0' and 0 are singlet and monogamous in nature) from one side to the other. In our study this entanglement transport is the perfect because the the adiabatic pumping physics based on Berry phase analysis is topologically protected against the external perturbations [21, 22, 24].

Here we consider two different Hamiltonian, H_1 and H_2 with modulated exchange coupling in xy and z directions respectively, Hamiltonians of the systems are the following

$$H_1 = - \sum_n J(1 - (-1)^n \delta_1(t))(S_+^n S_-^{n+1} + S_+^{n+1} S_-^n) + \sum_n \Delta S_z^n S_z^{n+1} \quad (3)$$

This model Hamiltonian has some experimental relevance [24]. The other model Hamiltonian is

$$H_2 = - \sum_n J(S_x^n S_x^{n+1} + S_y^n S_y^{n+1}) + \sum_n \Delta S_z^n S_z^{n+1} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_n B_0(1 - (-1)^n \delta_2(t)) S_z^n$$

Here we consider that the fluctuations is periodic over two lattice sites. We see that this model have essential ingredients to capture the adiabatic entanglement pumping. One can express spin chain systems to a spinless fermion systems through the application of Jordan-Wigner transformation. In Jordan-Wigner transformation the relation between the spin and the electron creation and annihilation operators are $S_n^z = \psi_n^\dagger \psi_n - 1/2$, $S_n^- = \psi_n \exp[i\pi \sum_{j=-\infty}^{n-1} n_j]$, $S_n^+ = \psi_n^\dagger \exp[-i\pi \sum_{j=-\infty}^{n-1} n_j]$, [25], where $n_j = \psi_j^\dagger \psi_j$ is the fermion number at site j . Spin operators in terms of bosonic field are the following.

$$\begin{aligned} S_n^x &= [c_2 \cos(2\sqrt{\pi K} \phi) + (-1)^n c_3] \cos(\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{K}} \theta), \\ S_n^y &= -[c_2 \cos(2\sqrt{\pi K} \phi) + (-1)^n c_3] \sin(\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{K}} \theta), \\ S_n^z &= \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{K}} \partial_x \phi + (-1)^n c_1 \cos(2\sqrt{\pi K} \phi), \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

$$\psi_r(x) = \frac{U_r}{\sqrt{2\pi\alpha}} e^{-i(r\phi(x) - \theta(x))} \quad (6)$$

r denotes the chirality of the fermionic fields, right (1) or left movers (-1). The operators U_r are operators that commute with the bosonic field. U_r of different species commute and U_r of the same species anticommute. ϕ field corresponds to the quantum fluctuations (bosonic) of spin and θ is the dual field of ϕ . They are related by this relation $\phi_R = \theta - \phi$ and $\phi_L = \theta + \phi$.

Using the standard machinery of continuum field theory [25], we finally get the bosonized Hamiltonians as H_0 is the gapless Tomonaga-Luttinger liquid part of the Hamiltonian.

After the application of continuum field-theory the Hamiltonian become, in terms of bosonic fields.

$$\begin{aligned} H_1 &= H_0 + \frac{E_{J_0} \delta_1(t)}{2\pi^2 \alpha^2} \int dx : \cos[2\sqrt{K} \phi(x)] : \\ &+ \frac{\Delta}{2\pi^2 \alpha^2} \int dx : \cos[4\sqrt{K} \phi(x)] : \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

$$\begin{aligned} H_2 &= H_0 + \frac{B_0 \delta_2(t)}{2\pi \alpha} \int dx : \cos[2\sqrt{K} \phi(x)] : \\ &+ \frac{\Delta}{2\pi^2 \alpha^2} \int dx : \cos[4\sqrt{K} \phi(x)] : - \frac{B_0}{2} \int dx \partial_x \phi \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Here, we would like to explain the basic aspects of quantum entanglement pumping in terms of spin pumping physics of our model Hamiltonians: An adiabatic sliding motion of one dimensional potential, in gapped Fermi surface (insulating state), pumps an integer numbers of particle per cycle. In our case the transport of Jordan-Wigner fermions (spinless fermions) is nothing but the transport of spin from one end of the chain to the other

end because the number operator of spinless fermions is related to the z-component of spin density [26]. We see that non-zero $\delta_1(t)$ and $\delta_2(t)$ introduce the gap at around the Fermi point and the system is in the insulating state (Peierls insulator). In this phase spinless fermions form the bonding orbital between the neighboring sites, which yields a valance band in the momentum space. It is well known that the physical behavior of the system is identical at these two Fermi points. We would like to analyse these double degeneracy point, following the seminal paper of Berry [23]: in our model Hamiltonian there are two adiabatic parameters $\delta_1(t)$ and $\delta_2(t)$. The Hamiltonian starts to evolve under the variation of these two adiabatic parameters, when the Hamiltonian returns to its original form after a time T , the total geometric phase acquired by the system is $\gamma_n(T) = \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_C \langle \psi_n | \nabla_R | \psi_n \rangle \cdot dR$, a line integral around a closed loop in two dimensional parameter space. Using Stokes theorem, one can write $\gamma_n(T) = \frac{i}{2\pi} \int \nabla_R \times \langle \psi_n | \nabla_R | \psi_n \rangle \cdot dS$. The flux Φ through a closed surface C is, $\Phi = \int B \cdot dS$. Therefore one can think of the Berry phase as flux of a magnetic field. Now we express, $B_n(K1) = \nabla_{K1} \times A_n(K1)$, and $A_n(K1) = \frac{i}{2\pi} \langle n(K1) | \nabla_{K1} | n(K1) \rangle$, where $K1 = (k, \delta_1(t), \delta_2(t))$. Here B_n and A_n are the fictitious magnetic field (flux) and vector potential of the nth Bloch band respectively. The degenerate points behave as a magnetic monopole in the generalized momentum space (K_1) [23], whose magnetic unit can be shown to be 1, analytically [23, 24]

$$\int_{S1} dS \cdot B_{\pm} = \pm 1 \quad (9)$$

positive and negative signs of the above equations are respectively for the conduction and valance band meet at the degeneracy points. S_1 represent an arbitrary closed surface which enclose the degeneracy point. In the adiabatic process the parameter $\delta_1(t)$ or $\delta_2(t)$ are changed along a loop (Γ) enclosing the origin (minima of the system). We define the expression for spin current (I) from the analysis of Berry phase. It is well known in the literature of adiabatic quantum pumping physics that two independent parameters are needed to achieve the adiabatic quantum pumping in a system [27]. Here one may consider these two parameters as the real and imaginary part of the fourier transform of a modulated coupling induce potential. When the shape of the potential will change in time, then it amounts to changing the phase and amplitude in time. The role of adiabatic parameters are not explicit in our study. Our formalism is different from others. We define the expression for spin current (I) from the analysis of Berry phase. Then according to the original idea of quantum adiabatic particle transport [21, 22, 24, 28], the total number of spinless fermions (I) which are transported from one side of this system to the other is equal to the total flux of the valance band, which penetrates the 2D closed sphere (S_2) spanned by the Γ

and Brillouin zone [24].

$$I = \int_{S2} dS \cdot B_{+1} = 1 \quad (10)$$

B_{+1} is directly related with the Berry phase ($\gamma_n(T)$) which is acquired by the system during the adiabatic variation of the exchange couplings the time period of the adiabatic process. This quantization is topologically protected against the other perturbation as long as the gap along the loop remains finite [24, 28]. Therefore the adiabatic entanglement pumping is constant over the arbitrarily long distance of the system. This result is in contrast with the existed results in the literature [8,19]. They have found that the entanglement decay exponentially after a certain distance.

Now we explain the quantum entanglement transfer for H_1 . The second term of the Hamiltonian for NN exchange interaction has originated from the x and y component of exchange interaction. This term implies that infinitesimal variation of coupling in lattice sites, is sufficient to produce a gap around the Fermi points. So when $1/2 < K < 1$, only these time dependent exchange couplings are relevant and lock the phase operator at $\phi = 0 + \frac{n\pi}{\sqrt{K}}$. Now the locking potential slides adiabatically. The speed of the sliding potential is low enough such that the system stays in the same valley, i.e., there is no scope to jump onto the other valley. The system will acquire 2π phase during one complete cycle of adiabatic process. This expection is easily verified when we notice the physical meaning of the phase operator ($\phi(x)$). Since the spatial derivative of the phase operator corresponds to the z-component of spin density, this phase operator is nothing but the minus of the spatial polarization of the z-component of spin, i.e., $P_s^z = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N j S_j^z$. Shindou has shown explicitly the equivalence between these two considerations [24]. During the adiabatic process $\langle \phi_t \rangle$ changes monotonically and acquires -2π phase. In this process P_s^z increases by 1 per cycle. We define it analytically as

$$\delta P_s^z = \int_{\Gamma} dP_s^z = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \int dx \partial_x \langle \phi(x) \rangle = 1 \quad (11)$$

This physics always hold as far as the system is locked by the sliding potential and $\Delta < 1$ [24]. The change of the spatial polarization by unity during a complete evaluation of adiabatic cycle implies that the transport of entanglement across the system. This is because the spatial derivative of the phase operator is the Cooper pair density in our system. The entanglement transport of this scenario can be generalized up to the value of Δ for which K is greater than $1/2$. In this limit, z-component of the exchange interaction has no effect on the entanglement pumping of our system. But when $K < 1/2$, then the interaction due to Δ becomes relevant and creates a gap in the excitation spectrum. This potential profile is

static. Therefore there is no scope to slide the potential and to get a adiabatic pumping across the system. The authors of Ref. [8, 19] have also found that when $\Delta > 1$ for XXZ AFM spin chain, the fidelity of AFM spin chain also decreases ,i.e., the entanglement transport decreases in this limit.

Similarly for the Hamiltonian H_2 , the second term of the Hamiltonian produce the gap and the pumping process is the same as that of H_1 . Therefore we conclude that the modulations in the in plane exchange coupling and also for the modulations in the z-directions yield the same adiabatic entanglement pumping.

In this pumping process the most favourable states of the system are the antiferromagnetic configuration $|010101\dots\rangle$ and $|101010\dots\rangle$ (0 stands for up spin and 1 stands for down spin). One may start from any antiferromagnetic states and transfer the spin of every site to the right by two sites to achieve the pumping. Therefore our test spin which we introduce at the one end of the spin, it hops to the right by two sites in every step. Thus when we study the entanglement transport between the spin $0'$ and 0 , then it is natural that entanglement also is transported through every alternate sites. The authors of Ref. [8, 19] have observed a very peculiar behaviour of entanglement transfer for AFM: the nonanalytical behaviour as a function of time. It is zero for most of the time and it suddenly grows up and forms a peak at a regular interval of time. But in our study the entanglement current is constant and it is almost perfect entanglement pumping. In their case the spin chain has the spin rotational symmetry. When one member of an entangled pair of qubits is transmitted through such a channel, then the two qubits states evolve to a Werner state [30]. But our spin chain systems there is no spin rotational invariant symmetry and the transport mechanism is also different. The physical scenario of our study is completely different from the existing physical picture. The quantized entanglement transport of this scenario can be generalized up to the value of Δ for which K is greater than $1/2$. In this limit, the z-component of the exchange interaction has no effect on the entanglement pumping physics of Hamiltonian. In this limit, z-component of the exchange interaction has no effect on the entanglement pumping of our system.

Here, we would like to explain the difference of entanglement transport between the FM and AFM spin chain, it has mentioned in the literature but the complete physical explanation is not upto the mark [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19]. As we know that entanglement is a quantum mechanical property, Schrodinger singled out many decades ago as "the characteristic of quantum mechanics" [31] and that has been studied extensively in connection with Bell's inequality [32]. FM ground state there is no difference between the classical and quantum mechanical ground state and the low lying excitations are spin-1 magnons. The AFM ground state has a complex

structure specified by the Bethe-ansatz solution. There are no similarities between classical and quantum mechanical ground state and first excited state of the AFM chain and as a result of the quantum mechanical property of the system the entanglement manifests prominently in the AFM spin chain. This is the only clear reason why AFM outperforms the FM spin chain.

Here we discuss possible sources of imperfections in the entanglement pumping process. The non-adiabatic contributions leave the system in an unknown superposition of states after the full cycle. Also the appearance of Landau-Zener transition in the pumping system should be negligible so that the system is in the ground state. This condition limits the pumping rate of entanglement by the mathematical relation $\frac{\hbar}{\tau} \ll J$. However even then the entanglement pumping is not perfect due to the non vanishing $\frac{J}{\Delta}$. Our effort also should take the elimination of entanglement pumping in the wrong directions. The residual exchange coupling may lead to a different spin state. An entangled spin transported through a correct exchange coupling modulation with probability P and through the residual exchange coupling with the probability $Q = 1 - P$. Therefore the pumping error in each site is $\frac{P}{Q}$. Our system consists of N sites. Therefore the probability of correct entanglement transport is $\sim P^{N/2}$ and wrong entanglement transport is $\sim Q^{N/2}$. The total pumping error, $(\frac{Q}{P})^{N/2}$, decreases with the number of sites in nanoscale spin chain. Therefore for the spin chain system entanglement transport is better for larger length compare to the smaller length with same exchange couplings.

Conclusions: we have presented the theoretical explanation of adiabatic entanglement pumping for our model Hamiltonians. We have found the perfect entanglement transport condition which cure the existed results in the literature. We have explained few physical findings of entanglement transport which were curious before this study.

The author would like to thank, The Center for Condensed Matter Theory of IISc for extended facility. Finally the author would like to thank Prof. R. Srikanth, Dr. T. Tulsı and Prof. Indrani Bose.

-
- [1] D. Kielpinski *et al.*, Nature **417**, 709 (2002).
 - [2] A. J. Skinner *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett **90**, 087901 (2003).
 - [3] A. Zeilinger, Rev. Mod. Phys. **71**, S288 (1999).
 - [4] A. Rauschenbeutel *et al.*, Science **288**, 2024 (2000).
 - [5] C. A. Sackett *et al.*, Nature (London) **404**, 256 (2000).
 - [6] M. Bayer *et al.*, Science **291**, 451 (2001).
 - [7] F. Plastina, R. Fazio, and G. M. Palma, Phys. Rev. B **64**, 113306 (2001).
 - [8] S. Bose, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 207901 (2003); arXiv:08021224.
 - [9] V. Subrahmanyam, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 034304 (2004). M.

- Christandl *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett **92**, 187902 (2004); J. Eisert *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett **93**, 190402 (2004); C. Albanese *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett **93**, 230502 (2004); V. Giovannetti and D. Burgarth, Phys. Rev. Lett **96**, 030501 (2006); T. Boness *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett **96**, 187201 (2004); J. Fitzsimons and J. Twamley, Phys. Rev. Lett **97**, 090502 (2006); A. Kay, Phys. Rev. Lett **98**, 010501 (2007).
- [10] T. J. Osborne and N. Linden, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 052315 (2004). D. Burthgarth and S. Bose, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 052315 (2005); M. Avellino *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 012321 (2006); A. Lyakhov and C. Bruder, Phys. Rev. B **74**, 235303 (2006).
- [11] A. Bayat and V. Karimipour, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 042330 (2005).
- [12] L. C. Venuti, *et al.* quant-ph/0703202; L. C. Venuti, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 247206 (2006).
- [13] O. Romero-Isart, K. Eckert and A. Sanpera, Phys. Rev. A **75**, R050303 (2007).
- [14] K. Eckert, O. Romero-Isart, and A. Sanpera, New J. Phys. **9**, 155 (2007).
- [15] V. Srinivasa, J. Levy and C. S. Hellberg, quant-ph/0606809.
- [16] M. J. Hartmann, *et al.*, New J. Phys. **8**, 94 (2006).
- [17] L. Amico, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 022304 (2004).
- [18] M. Horodecki, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **60**, 18888 (1999).
- [19] A. Bayat and S. Bose, arXiv:0811.4695V2.
- [20] C. F. Hirjibehedin *et al.* Science **312**, 1021 (2006); A. J. Heinrich *et al.* Science **306**, 466 (2004).⁴
- [21] D. J. Thouless, Phys. Rev. B **27**, 6083 (1983).
- [22] Q. Niu, Q and D. J. Thouless, J. Phys. A **17**, 2453 (1984).
- [23] M. V. Berry, Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A **392**, 45 (1984).
- [24] R. Shindou, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn **74**, 1214 (2005).
- [25] Giamarchi. T, *Quantum Physics in One Dimension* (Oxford Science Publications, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 2004).
- [26] $S_n^z = \frac{1}{2\pi} \partial_x \phi(x_n) - \frac{(-1)^n}{\pi\alpha} \sin(\phi(x_n))$. ϕ field corresponds to the quantum fluctuations (boson) of spin.
- [27] P. Sharma and C. Chamon, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 96401 (2001); P. Sharma and C. Chamon cond-mat/0209291; P. W. Brouwer, Phys. Rev. B **58**, 10135 (1998).
- [28] J. E. Avron, A. Raveh and B. Zur, Rev. Mod. Phys. **60**, 873 (1988); J. E. Avron, J. Berger and Y. Last, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 511 (1997).
- [29] S. Sarkar and C. D. Hu, Phys. Rev. B, **77**, 064413 (2008).
- [30] C. H. Bennett *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 3824 (1996).
- [31] E. Schrodinger, Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **31**, 555 (1935).
- [32] J. S. Bell, Physics **1**, 195 (1964).